

PATENT APPLICATION  
Response under 37 C.F.R. §1.116  
Attorney Docket No.: 678-1171 (P10944)

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

<b>APPLICANT(S):</b>	EOM, Su-Hyung	<b>GROUP ART UNIT:</b> 2609
<b>APPLICATION NO.:</b>	10/777,430	<b>EXAMINER:</b> TAYONG, Helene E.
<b>FILING DATE:</b>	February 12, 2004	<b>DATED:</b> November 7, 2007

**FOR:           METHOD FOR SYNCHRONIZING DATA FRAMES IN A DIGITAL  
COMMUNICATION SYSTEM**

Mail Stop AF  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.116**

Sir:

In response to the Final Office Action of the United States Patent and Trademark Office dated September 7, 2007, please consider the following Request for Reconsideration.

## **REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION**

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-22 are pending in the application, with Claims 1, 5, 9, and 16 being independent claims. Claims 1-5, 7-17, 21, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Anantharaman et al.* (US Patent Publication No. 2002/0093978 A1). In addition, Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Anantharaman et al.* (US Patent Publication No. 2002/0093978 A1) in view of *Quirk et al.* (US Patent No. 5,675,617 A). Also, Claims 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Anantharaman et al.* (US Patent Publication No. 2002/0093978 A1) in view of *Park et al.* (US Patent No. 6,529,528 B1).

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the Examiner's grant of a telephonic discussion with Applicant's counsel, Ryan C. Carter, Esq., which was held on October 16, 2007. In the discussion, said counsel advised the Examiner of the lack in the Office Action of any response to Applicant's allegation that *Park* was not prior art herein. It was asserted that in view of at least this failure to respond, and the lack of any adjudication on the merits of the argument that *Park* was not prior art, the Final Office Action was incomplete and should be withdrawn. It is respectfully noted that after speaking to the supervisor about the issue, the Examiner informed said counsel that upon receipt of this Response, the Final Office Action herein would be withdrawn and a Supplemental Office Action would be issued.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Final Office Action herein be withdrawn, and that a Supplemental Office Action be issued in conformance with the foregoing discussion.

Independent Claims 1, 5, 9 and 16 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Without conceding the patentability per se of dependent Claims 2-4, 6-8, 10-15 and 17-22, these are likewise believed to be allowable by virtue of their dependence on their respective independent

claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of dependent Claims 2-4, 6-8, 10-15 and 17-22 is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 1-22, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicant's attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Paul J. Farrell", is written over the typed name.

Paul J. Farrell  
Reg. No. 33,494  
Attorney for Applicant

THE FARRELL LAW FIRM  
333 Earle Ovington Blvd. Suite 701  
Uniondale, New York 11553  
Tel: (516) 228-3565  
Fax: (516) 228-8475

PJF/RCC/dr